TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

The *National Era* is published every Thursday, on the following terms:

Single copy, one year - - - - - $2.00
Three copies, one year - - - - - 5.00
Five copies, one year - - - - - 8.00
Ten copies, one year - - - - - 15.00
Single copy, six months - - - - 1.00
Ten copies, six months - - - - - 8.00

Voluntary agents are entitled to retain 50 cents commission on each yearly, and 25 cents commission on each semi-yearly, subscriber, *except in the case of Clubs.*

A Club of five subscribers, at $8, will entitle the person making it up to a copy for 6 months; a Club of ten, at $15, to a copy for one year. When a Club has been forwarded, additions may be made to it, on the same terms.

THE NATIONAL ERA.

G. BAILEY, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR; JOHN G. WHITTIER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. XII. WASHINGTON, D. C., THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1858. NO. 594.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

Ten cents a line for the *first* insertion, *five* cents a line for each subsequent one. Ten words constitute a line. Payment in advance is invariably required.

☞ Money may be forwarded by mail at *my risk*. Notes on Eastern banks preferred. Large amounts may be remitted in drafts or certificates of deposit.

☞ Subscribers wishing their papers changed, will give the name of the post office changed *from*, as well as the post office they wish it hereafter sent *to*.

☞ All communications to the *Era*, whether on business of the paper or for publication, should be addressed to

G. BAILEY, *Washington, D. C*

WASHINGTON, D. C.

LIFE IN PARIS.

PARIS, *April* 23, 1858.

Bernard's Acquittal—The final issue of an action brought against Mr. Perrotin by the Queen of Sweden, daughter of Prince Eugene de Beauharnais—Marshal Castellane at Marseilles—The Weather—The Imperial Family—Liszt, the Pianist.

To the Editor of the National Era:

Should we judge of the state of public feeling by the tenor of the Imperial organ, and especially by that of a more bigoted Christian journal, a warm advocate of Catholicism, every man, woman, and child, in France, is indignant at the jury, the judges, the lawyers, and the people of England in general, for the acquittal of the French refugee, Bernard, arraigned as an accomplice of Orsini in the attempt made on January 14th to assassinate the Emperor Napoleon. The Napoleon party is undoubtedly furious at the final result of that trial, for it was confidently expected in France that the English nation would sacrifice that Frenchman, guilty or not guilty, to gratify the wounded pride of the Emperor, and to smooth over the ruffled feelings of his party. But, as Bernard's lawyer said, "the English are not afraid of six hundred thousand French bayonets;" and the jury did not see fit to condemn one man to please another.

The journey, the standard-bearer of the Holy See, and bitter enemy of the English and American heretics, says: "It looks as if war were inevitable between the two allies; and the English press is making every possible effort to increase the irritated state of feeling existing with one party in France." The *Times*, in reply to the remarks made by the French press with respect to the occupation of the island of Perim, and the filibustering propensities of the Anglo-Saxon race, recently expressed itself in the most insolent terms with respect to the so-called French engineers meddling in matters concerning none but the English themselves.

Nothing can prevent an outbreak of hostility, except the reciprocal commercial interest of both countries. Since the time of Napoleon I, the commercial interests of France have become so intimately interwoven with those of England and other countries, that a war would be ruinous to all. Should the party perceive that its interests were in danger, it would not hesitate to join the Republicans, and assist in upsetting the present dynasty, to uphold its commercial relations. Napoleon must be aware of it, and without doubt has studied the history of his uncle with care enough to be assured of the faults he committed; and aware, as he must be, that the dynasty of the Napoleons is only secure under the development of the art of peace, he will take care that the doors of the temple of Janus remain closed.

I made mention in a previous letter of an action brought before the Civil Tribunal by the Queen of Sweden and the other children of the late Prince Eugene Beauharnais against Mr. Perrotin, the publisher, to compel him to insert in all new editions of the *Memoires du Marechal Marmont Duc de Raguse*, certain documents calculated to disprove an assertion injurious to the honor of the Prince, made in that work. The allegation in question was to the effect that in 1813, when France was invaded by the allies, the Emperor Napoleon ordered Prince Eugene to hring into France the army of Italy, which he then commanded, where preparations are being made to receive them.

The Queen of Holland and the Princess Olga are to reach Fontainebleau about the 10th of the coming month, and will most probably spend the greater part of their visit there.

The following extraordinary example of eccentricity is related by a Swedish journal:

"Dr. Rhnders, physician, has set to music the palpitations and irregular beatings of the heart of a female, who is a patient in the hospital at Upsal. This disease, written in musical notes, with quavers and semiquavers, forms," says the journal, "a kind of waltz, and is one of the greatest curiosities of pathological anatomy."

It is reported that the great pianist, Liszt, was solemnly received, on the 11th inst, into the order of Francicsens at Pesth.

THE MISSIONARY EXPLORER.

From Blackwood.

It is some time since any volume has made so much noise, or excited so great an interest as the narrative of Dr. Livingstone. This is the story of a remarkable man, but in all other wise a remarkable book; and it is to the credit of this generation, which loves "style" so much, and is so greatly influenced by literary graces, that a work so entirely devoid of both should, nevertheless, have attained so remarkable a popularity. We permit the great Whig historian to put upon record almost anything he pleases, because not a man of us has the heart to condemn a narrative so fascinating; and we receive the wildest caprices of an amateur as serious criticism on art, simply because nature has gifted the said amateur with the most wonderful graces of language; yet we are not so unreasoning in our admirations as we seem. When a man has really something to tell us, we are content that he should tell it in his own way. It is a large testimonial to the good sense of the age, which, after all, cannot be so superficial as people call it, that Dr. Livingstone has a report to make, of travels and an enterprise, quite wonderful, and, we presume, almost unparalleled. He says, with evident truth, that he would rather undertake the journey over again, than write his account of it; and, accordingly, no one attempts to judge him on a ground he does not attempt to take. He is not a literary man, nor a dilettanti. He holds the pen in a toil-bardened hand, evidently has been more familiar with axe and gun than with the dainty implements of civilized life. What he has to tell us of is an unknown and undeveloped continent, the fourth quarter of the world; a country hitherto shut up and barred by unhealthy coasts and untracked deserts; a great, savage, impenetrable waste, where the great old lords of the forest still exist and reign; where the least religious race of the world live their naked life of exposure and privation, in the midst of which our own Empire, the biggest policeman in the universe, keeps an expensive and half-successful watch, lest the poor black souls, for whom we can do nothing better, should be eaten and sold by each other. Livingstone, however, means to do something better for them. He has been high up into the home of the race, where there is neither policeman nor slave trade, but villagefuls and tribes of trainable human creatures living over seas. He has seen the natural highways which track that silent and unrepresented territory. The soil has disclosed to him its voiceless secrets in leaf of tree and form of weed, which tell tales of unmade fortune to the educated eye. He has found out how men can live and travel in the deserts, and how commerce may enter and flourish. He comes home laden with hopes, prospects, and promises—the noble idea that he is adding power and wealth to his own country, while he carries salvation to another; and it is all this, the promises, the prospects, the hopes—a capacity which seems to him unlimited, yet a want which is touching and excessive—which make up the importance of Dr. Livingstone's book. All this he knows; all this he has come to tell, anxiously and earnestly—and to this with one accord, and without any depreciatory criticisme, the public has been heartily content to incline its serious ear.

While we write, he is just about returning out of a serious course of lion or hero worship, which, it is to be hoped, has done no worse for him than to bore and weary his spirit. Dr. Livingstone is a man to be petted in the best sense of the word, and has allowed to him the full measure of his peculiar circle; but for real, hearty, sincere hero-worship, fooling to the very top of one's bent, there is certainly no community in existence half so successful as the British public." The position of the coteries is nothing to the lion of the churches, and we trust that the African apostle has not found the ordeal too hard for him. He goes out with all the encouragement and sympathy which society can bring upon him, with an unparalleled amount of public sympathy, and with even the recognition and authority of Government to give dignity to his further labors; and the Court and the Court circle are capabilities remain in the office which he has already raised in honorable reputation, and from which he has taught us to expect in the future still greater results.

It is not necessary to disobey after everybody has heard from this traveller's own lips so much as it was needful to tell of his own history, to give any sketch of that here. He was one of those Scotch students who never could by any chance be fellows of their college, but become one of those grave laborers towards a special end, who strike through Latin and Greek, perhaps without any remarkable devotion to those exclusive and jealous channels of learning, mastering as much as may be marked and all the cark of daily labors—a man who did not peruse his education through the hard struggle of its acquirement merely for education's sake, with the disinterested zeal of an Oxford scholar, but who worked hardly through his necessary *curriculum* as a means, and not an end. Reading amid the clatter of machinery in a Glasgow mill taught the future explorer how to read and write amid the clatter of surrounding savages; and the hardness of a poor man's early life trained him for the principles of his mission. He went out of the heart of the Scottish peasant-world, while most Cottar fathers still justified the picture of the Saturday night; he went out from the hands of a strong training and theological lectures, indebted to no one; and, finally, by dint of disappointment in his first idea of going to China, fell into the office and vocation appointed for him, and for which he has proved himself so fit, when he went to Africa eighteen years ago, to join the missionary party which has already made itself celebrated by the narrative and labors of Moffat, married there the daughter of his predecessor, and lived and labored in the midst of the parent station in the first place, and afterwards at one founded by himself, which a long drought and a raid of Boers at last compelled him to abandon—for nearly ten years. Then the effects of that long residence in such a prophet in the desert. He began to discover, and the impulse grew upon him—but it is only after a long course of quiet life and unrecorded exertions among those savages—exertions which seem to have opened his intelligence widely among them, but which it is not easy to trace in his story, where all the ordinary details of missionary experience are omitted, and with no probability in consequence, somewhat confused and hurried on the whole, and not to be followed easily—that the characteristic feature of his personal vocation begine to be developed. This, which is the great distinction of Dr. Livingstone's work and book, is a long, toilsome, solitary, and, most remarkable of all, *successful* journey, from one end to another of the scorching continent, of which this event has made him a kind of moral superior and governor.

The occasion of this remarkable undertaking is perhaps as singular as the enterprise itself. The missionary, obliged to abandon the first scene of his independent labors at Kolobeng, where a tyrannical and barbarous colony of African Dutchmen opposed and insulted both himself and his pupils, set out up country towards the lands of a remarkable chief, whose territory he intended to make his future centre of operations. He carried all his patriarchal and primitive wealth, his wife and his children, with him into the new region—meaning to settle there; but that was not his appointed service, as it appeared. The great chief died almost at the moment of the stranger's arrival; the locality was still unhealthful—exposed to fever and malaria; and, most momentous of all, signs of an incipient slave trade appeared to the jealous eyes of the missionary. The Makololo gentlemen were splendid in garments of red and green baize, and dressing-gowns of printed calico; and the manner in which they had attained these grandeurs was by a beginning of slave traffic, fatal to the hopes of their new teacher. The Mambari, a tribe of native traders, bed brought these tempting vanities for the first time among the nobler savages for whom Dr. Livingstone was chiefly concerned. Sebituane, the chief already mentioned, was a conqueror and warrior, the chief of a superior and triumphant race. He had already subdued under his own sway a population of primitive helots, of whom his Makololo were the patrician and governing class. This superior race and legislator could not resist the temptation of acquiring guns, even by the sacrifice of servants. He consented to sell the children of his tributaries for those precious firearms, and his subjects, his own people, gave him up without excuses and compunctions. But the evil had begun, though slightly, and the missionary found himself called upon to act with energy and promptitude. He explains thus, in his own words, his first reason for his journey:

"In talking with my companion over these matters, the idea was suggested, that if the slave market was supplied with articles of European manufacture by legitimate commerce, the trade in slaves would become impossible. It seemed more feasible to give the goods, for which the people now part with their servants, in exchange for ivory and other products of the country, and thus prevent the trade at the beginning, than try to put a stop to it in any of the subsequent steps. This could only be effected by establishing a highway from the coast to the centre of the country.

"As there was no hope of the Boers allowing the peaceable instruction of the natives at Kolobeng, I at once resolved to save my family from exposure to this unhealthy region by sending them to England, and to return alone, with a view to exploring the country in search of a healthy district that might prove a centre of civilization, and open up the interior by a path to either the east or the west coast."

Thus, while the British Empire stood with its pistol and cutlass on the coast, a grand sentry and watchman, to intercept the guilty conveyors on their exit, the stout Scotsman in the interior set himself to dam up the fountain-head of this stream of bitterness. Geographical science and commercial enterprise, so beneficial largely by the missionary's discoveries; but this enterprise was not undertaken for the benefit of either. Let the interests of humanity for once triumph over the inquisitions of knowledge. Dr. Livingstone was not a geographical pioneer even for whom we can do nothing better, should be taken out of the list of the guilty. Livingstone, however, means to do something better for them. He has been high up into the home of the race, where there is neither policeman nor slave trade, but villagefuls and tribes of trainable human creatures living over seas. He has seen the natural highways which track that silent and unrepresented territory. The soil has disclosed to him its voiceless secrets in leaf of tree and form of weed, which tell tales of unmade fortune to the educated eye. He has found out how men can live and travel in the deserts, and how commerce may enter and flourish. He comes home laden with hopes, prospects, and promises—the noble idea that he is adding power and wealth to his own country, while he carries salvation to another; and it is all this, the promises, the prospects, the hopes—a capacity which seems to him unlimited, yet a want which is touching and excessive—which make up the importance of Dr. Livingstone's book. All this he knows—

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1858.

☞ "I believe I am the only subscriber in ——, and I want company in the enjoyment which the *Era* is sure to bring to those who read it. I believe that with the single copy I have taken, I have converted many to Republicanism."

So writes a subscriber, sending us a small addition to our list. Who will do likewise? We must confess it is rather a dull time with us just now. Our agents are suffering subscriptions to run out without renewing them. A little attention to the circulation of the *Era* is greatly needed. It is a hard matter to stand the competition with the One Dollar and with the Sensation Weeklies.

☞ In our columns will be found an appeal put forth by the National Republican Association of this city, for funds to enable them to make a free distribution of documents in Congressional districts now represented by Administration or Pro-Slavery Democrats. We hope the appeal will meet with a prompt and liberal response from the friends of the Republican cause.

THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN ASSOCIATION.

This Association, which has its headquarters in this city, had a full and spirited meeting at their rooms on Saturday night last.

Senator Seward, of New York, being present, was invited to address the Association; which he did in an able and telling speech of about an hour's length.

He began by alluding to the fact that he was born in a slave State, and was the son of a slaveholder; but that during his boyhood the people of his native State began to perceive that Slavery was against the rights of man, the interests of society, and contrary to the laws of God; and they took steps to free themselves from its unholy and blighting effects. Almost immediately the State of New York rose from the fourth or fifth rank, to the first, foremost, and noblest—the *Empire State* of this Union.

The able Senator then took a rapid view of the condition of society from our first knowledge of its organization, which showed that Slavery had always existed, and in almost every nation of the earth, until within a period of a few hundred years. Finally, a new order of civilization began to dawn upon the world. Labor and the laborer began to be respected, as mankind began to feel their dependence upon them for defence, for support, and for the conveniences and luxuries of life. Then free cities were established, and portions of the laboring class became free and independent citizens.

Allusion was then made to the early Portuguese and Spanish discoveries and dominions, when they were so vast that the Pope of Rome divided the world between them. But these nations had no laborers. Chivalry was all they could boast. In order to plant colonies in their vast possessions, they must have laborers. Then it was that Portugal began the slave trade upon the coast of Africa, and Spain endeavored to enslave the native tribes of America. This was not the civilization to establish or perpetuate nations, and these Powers began to crumble away, until now they occupy little more than their original limits.

A glowing tribute was then paid to the laborer. Governor Seward dared to offend the merchant, or the doctor of divinity, but the laboring man he *dared not* to offend. The address was closed by congratulating the Association upon its success thus far, and its future promise of good. The Association finds cause for self-gratulation in the fact, that, under its auspices, Gov. Seward made this his first political speech in Washington.

The Association adopted the following as their platform of principles:

Platform of the National Republican Association.

Adopted May 15, 1858.

For the purpose of co-operating with all who oppose the extension of Slavery and the domination of the Slave Power, and who seek to extend and perpetuate the blessings of Liberty, we have associated ourselves together, under the title of the National Republican Association, and adopt as the general basis of our action the following principles:

1. The Federal Government has no power over the system of Slavery within the States; but within its own exclusive jurisdiction it has the power, and ought to exert it, to secure life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, to all men.

2. There should be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude, except for the punishment of crime, in any of the Territories of the United States.

3. The people are the rightful source of all political power; and all officers should, as far as practicable, be chosen by a direct vote of the People.

4. Candidates for political offices should be men of undoubted integrity and sobriety, and pledged to support the principles of this Platform by all lawful and constitutional means.

THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD.

We call the attention of our readers to the new schedule for Summer Travel on the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, printed in our advertising columns. It will be seen that the amplest facilities are secured to travellers from all sections. By new combinations, the Company is enabled to run three through trains, daily, East and West, and the greatest attention is paid to making the connections, and providing for the comfort of the passengers. Two of the trains, each way, will pass over the mountains in the daytime, so as to afford an opportunity to enjoy some of the grandest scenery in the world. The Baltimore *American* says:

"It is also contemplated, we are told, in fair weather, to make a brief stoppage of the trains at the grandest of the Cheat river viaducts, where a scene is presented that may be called the climax of the road.

"With the present almost entirely finished condition of the several tunnels—now as endurably arched as human skill can render them—with its new and improved hotels and dining-halls, with its system of thorough conductors and its mode of supplying travellers needed information, and of affording other rare courtesies to its patrons, with the watchfulness and care of its train-men and other employees, its complete and exclusive telegraphic lines, with its new and powerful passenger train locomotives, which, by their exclusive use of coke as a fuel, insure to travellers a freedom from smoke and sparks—with these, we say, added to the grander attractions, which are becoming so widely known and appreciated, the passenger business of the Baltimore and Ohio Company ought to become much more enlarged during the coming season. Certainly no more attractive and interesting line of travel can be offered in our country than that which this road presents."

The Company has also been at pains to furnish new conveniences of travel on the Washington Branch. The principal train will leave Baltimore for Washington at 6.45, instead of 8 o'clock. "While this is a pleasant hour for travellers from Baltimore in the summer season, this train, by reaching Washington at 8.30, will accommodate the numerous Government officials and others, who propose to reside along the line during the season. This train will also reach Washington in time to connect with the steamers for Mount Vernon, and it is contemplated to establish through round trip tickets between Baltimore and Mount Vernon, by which visiters may view that sacred place and return home upon the same evening."

An examination of the schedule will show other arrangements, demanded by the wants of the Public. The Company deserves great credit for its intelligent enterprise.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND ITS ACCUSERS.

A political party is not a church or a philanthropic association. It is not organized for the purpose of establishing theological opinions and disseminating piety, or of sending bibles and missionaries to the Heathen.

A civil government that should attempt to repress sin and spread holiness, by pains and penalties, by fine, imprisonment, and the halter, or which should take money from the pockets of the People to dispense for eleemosynary objects, would be guilty of an invasion of the rights of God and man. It is bound to protect absolute freedom of inquiry into all subjects, but it may not propagate religious ideas. It may not undertake to disseminate piety, although it is bound to secure to every man the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. It may not punish sin, merely because it is sin, for that is the prerogative of the Almighty; but it is bound to punish crime. It may control the acts, but it cannot reach the heart. It may constrain respect for the rights of man; it cannot awaken love to God. Its true object is, to protect every individual within its jurisdiction in the enjoyment of life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness, thus securing peace, order, and progress; and the Principle which should govern its action is, Equality of Rights, which is only another name for Justice.

The sphere of civil government defines the sphere of politics. A Party has no right to propose for action what Government is restrained from doing. The limitation of one must be the limitation of the other.

It is nonsense to say that, under this definition, a Political Party must necessarily be selfish. If by this be meant, that it is not a benevolent association, is not organized for the sole purpose of doing good to others, then it is selfish—but we submit that this is an abuse of language. By selfishness, we always mean that Principle or Feeling which leads a man to sacrifice the rights and interests of others, when they conflict with his own interest or pleasure. To seek his own improvement, comfort, welfare, is not *selfish*, if at the same time he shall respect and seek the interests of his neighbor—in other words, love his neighbor as himself. As with the individual, so with the Party. If it give evidence, by its acts, that it seeks power for the sake of the benefits it brings to itself, at the cost of the interests of others, or even without reference to them, it is selfish, and ought to be repudiated by the People. But if, while aiming at power, while proposing to discharge the functions of government according to its ideas of policy, it at the same time respects the rights of all within the sphere of its action, and is at pains to do justice to them all, it deserves the confidence of the People; and he who denounces it as selfish, because it is not a philanthropical association, governed solely by considerations for the interests of others, is guilty of an absurdity and an injustice. If its controlling Idea be, Justice to all within the sphere of its action, the Protection and Advancement of all legitimate Interests within the jurisdiction of the Government whose power it would direct, it is all that philanthropist or divine can ask of it.

We should not have thought it necessary to present these elementary views, but for a sweeping invective against the Republican Party lately published in the New York *Independent* by the Rev. George B. Cheever. We are not a partisan, and cannot be said to belong properly to any Party; but we deeply regret that a man of the position of Dr. Cheever should see proper to denounce so unqualifiedly the only imposing Political organization in the country, pledged by its professions and its *acts* to the Principle of Equal Rights.

If it be true that no Political Party deserves support, which does not undertake to define what is sin against God, and pledge itself to its extermination wherever found, Dr. Cheever's denunciation of the Republicans is all right—for certainly that is not their position. The individuals composing the Republican Party may agree with Dr. Cheever, or they may not. Some of them are religious men, and, in the several church organizations to which they belong, are prepared to unite with him in appropriate action on the subject of Slavery—but they are not prepared to convert their Party into an ecclesiastical body. Some of them are Philanthropists, and are ready to do all that can be done by Christian instrumental ities for the redemption of the enslaved everywhere—but they are not willing to convert their Party into a philanthropic association. All regard Slavery, whoever may be its victims, as a violation of the rights of human nature, a barbarous and cruel system, repugnant to Democratic Ideas, a formidable obstacle to Human Progress, and do not hesitate to say so—but as a Party they claim no right to interfere with it, where the Government which they seek to control has no right of interference. And yet, because the *Party* will not do this, will not usurp ecclesiastical functions, will not act as a benevolent association, will not proclaim Slavery "a sin," "worthy of death," and, of course, pledge itself to overthrow this "sin," punish the sinner, and rescue the four millions sinned against, it falls under the maledictions of Dr. Cheever. It is guilty of "unmingled and absorbing selfishness;" it is engaged "no longer in a conflict against enslaving others," but only in "self-defence;" "the deliberate renunciation of all obligations of justice or mercy to the enslaved, the forgetfulness and disregard of principle toward God and benevolence toward man, and the degradation of the warfare to a mere strife of political superiority between the slave States and the free, or between slave labor and free, are indications ominous of evil!"

"The thing against which a majority in the House of Representatives have been stiffened and propped up to a transitory display of steadfastness, was not the monstrous iniquity of forcing the black persons upon a Slave State, but that of forcing a *Constitution* upon the State, *without consent of the white people*. The inhumanity and immorality of *Slavery* itself, and injustice and wickedness of enslaving *the blacks*, would not have provoked a conflict. On the naked principle of opposition against Slavery, or against enslaving the blacks, a majority could not have been rallied."

He proceeds, turning over and over this same Idea, putting it in different forms, each form darker and more damning than the preceding one, all the resources of an *ad captandum* rhetoric being taxed to crush the Party under the overwhelming odium of mean, sneaking selfishness. See how he rolls the accusation, as a precious morsel, under his tongue.

Not the trial and most detestable iniquity in this complicated and accumulated series of wrongs, "has prompted and steadied this opposition," but "merely the manner of enforcing it." "Not at all the making Slaves of human beings without their own consent, but the doing of it without the consent of the People," "has excited all this indignation, wrath, and opposition, both of the Senate and House of Representatives."

"The central iniquity in this scheme, at which the old prophets would have called upon the heavens to be astonished, and the earth to be afraid with horrible amazement, is the deliberate establishment of Slavery, in the most heaven-defying and infamous terms. The right of property in human beings is distinctly affirmed in the Constitution proposed to be enforced, as before and higher than any constitutional sanction. The right of property in man is in fact assumed as one of the rights *of* man; and it is declared that 'the right of any owner of a slave to such a slave and its increase is the same and as inviolable as the right of any owner of any property whatsoever.' Had the terms of this proposition been purposely studied to obtain as insulting and daring a mode of affirming the perpetual and inviolable right of Slavery as language could contrive, obviously, no more definite and compact sign could be hit upon, than the use of the impersonal pronoun ITS, in reference to the human chattel, THE SLAVE AND ITS INCREASE."

And then he goes on again, with his rhetoric, assuming that not this excited the abhorrence of the Opposition, but only the refusal to give the People an opportunity to say whether the damning iniquity should be sanctified. To heighten the effect, he adds:

"Senator Crittenden's amendment makes all right, *by submitting it to the people whether they will choose to enslave others*; the perfect *right* to enslave, *if the people choose*, not being questioned or controverted! Nay, by such a submission, as being the rectification and cure of the whole matter, it is admitted that the right to enslave is an elementary, native, intrinsic right of popular sovereignty, one of the rights of man, rightfully to be enshrined in the people's bill of rights, and in the State Constitution."

The remaining column of the article is in precisely the same strain of bitter invective, all turning upon the assumption that the Republicans have renounced hostility to Slavery, and opposition to the extension of Slavery, have become purely selfish in their aims; contend now only for superiority of political power; were not shocked or indignant at the complicated villainy that sought to fasten Slavery on Kansas, because they were opposed to enslaving others, but because the will of the whole People in Kansas was not consulted—that in voting for the Crittenden amendment, they admitted that the right to enslave is one of the rights of man—"the only privilege defended, the only right insisted on, is the privilege and right of Popular Sovereignty by itself, to determine the establishment and perpetuity of crime."

Can it be that preachers, like editors, sometimes write for mere effect? that, in the glow of composition, they at times lose sight of the metes and bounds of truth? that occasionally a passion for antithesis or epigram, or a fondness for brilliant turns of expression, makes them forget to ask the question, is this just?

Be this as it may, Dr. Cheever's article is more distinguished by its heat, its wrath, its antithesis, its brilliancy of invective, than by its truth or justice. From beginning to end, he misrepresents the Republican Party—its doctrines, its motives, its policy, its particular acts—misrepresents too the political movement with which it identifies it.

We said that, if the controlling idea of a Party be, justice to all within the sphere of its action, the protection and advancement of all legitimate interests within the jurisdiction of the Government whose powers it wields or seeks to direct, it is all that philanthropist or divine could ask. Neither would be justified in denouncing it as selfish, or disloyal to the interests of humanity. We say that this is the position of the Republican Party. Measuring its responsibilities by the powers of the Government it aims to control, its purpose is to protect all rights, and promote all legitimate interests within the jurisdiction of that Government. Would you have it do more? Shall it *usurp* power, under the pretence that a certain great evil cannot otherwise be reached? Shall it be condemned as giving aid and countenance to a wrong, because, having no power of redress, it will not usurp it? Will you arraign it as an apostate, for "renouncing obligations" which it has never recognised, and which have never rested upon it?

In common with a large majority of the citizens of free States, it regards Slavery as a moral, political, economical, and social evil—a wrong and woe to the Slave—a curse to the community that tolerates it—repugnant to Christianity and modern Civilization. It sees fully, eloquently, and cogently presented than by the Republican members of Congress. Under every aspect, moral, political, social, economical—as a question of political power, of constitutional law, of ethics—in its relations to masters and slaves, States and Territories, North and South, the United States and the civilized world—the Question has been treated with ability and boldness. True, it has not been dealt with in the language of the pulpit or presbytery. Politicians are not preachers, statesmen are not ecclesiastical doctors; and yet they may love Justice and labor for Humanity just as well; may be as sincere advocates of the Rights of Man, as if they should substitute for the language of the People the set phrases of the Clergy.

As to the special treatment of this Kansas Question, they have aimed, first, to keep Slavery out of the Territory, secondly, to protect the People against oppression. It is not true that they have lost sight of the first object, in their attention to the second. Both were and are inseparable. To prevent the oppression of the white man in Kansas, is to prevent the enslavement of the black man; for it was fondly impossible to establish Slavery in the Territory, without subverting the rights of the white man. Now, are we to overlook the fraud and violence towards the white people of Kansas, lest we be suspected of indifference on the question of Slavery, and this, too, when these very wrongs to the white man have been committed for the sake of extending Negro Slavery?

Despotism is hateful, whoever may be the victims. Villanies and frauds, like those perpetrated in Kansas, will excite indignation—will be and ought to be exposed and dealt upon, until retribution overtake the evil-doers. The right of self-government, stricken down in Kansas by an unscrupulous Administration, ought to be restored and upheld. Is it a crime in the Republican Party to take this ground? Because it has labored to do justice to the white People of Kansas, must it be charged with unmitigated selfishness, and denounced as having ceased to labor to prevent the establishment of the Slavery of the black man?

Dr. Cheever cannot produce a resolve from any Republican Convention, a sentence from the speech of any Republican Congressman, a single act of the Republican Party, to justify his inconsiderate invective.

In a House where it had simply a plurality, not a majority, it succeeded in electing a Speaker, representing distinctly the Policy of Freedom to Kansas, and Freedom to all the Territories. It voted repeatedly to bring Kansas into the Union as a free State; against all attempts to authorize the formation of a State Constitution under such circumstances as would hazard the fate of Liberty; and it secured a Commission for investigating and bringing to light the atrocities which had been committed in the attempt to plant Slavery in the new Territory. By its efforts, throughout the country and in Kansas, it has succeeded, so far, in defeating the scheme of Slavery-propagandists, and practically preventing the extension of Slavery.

Can it be that the key to this clerical invective is to be found in the vote of the Republicans for the Crittenden-Montgomery amendment? Ah! says the orator—it was not Slavery—it was not the attempt to plant the system in Kansas—it was not the assertion of the right of property in man—it was not the attempt to perpetuate the monstrous crime for all time, that provoked your wrath, aroused and steadied your opposition; it was simply because all this villainy was attempted in disregard of the rights of the People of Kansas. If they would sanction it, well and good—it would all be right. So, you voted for the Crittenden-Montgomery amendment, for the purpose of allowing them to sanction or reject the villany, just as they might please. "You admitted that the right to enslave is an elementary, native, intrinsic right of popular sovereignty." That was all!

Unpardonable misrepresentation! In no instance have the Republicans relaxed their opposition to Slavery in Kansas. Their unintermitted struggle has been to prevent its establishment. They fought the bill to admit Kansas under the slave Constitution of Lecompton, because it recognised Slavery, because it recognised it in a most revolting style, because it was a spurious Constitution, and because it was against the will and in disregard of the rights of the large majority of its People. It was not only the *manner of forming and adopting* the Constitution, as Dr. Cheever assumes, but the abominable thing itself, that provoked their wrath and steadied their opposition. To a man, they spoke and voted against it in the Senate; to a man, they voted against it in the House, their whole vote, 92, being recorded for its rejection. Failing in this, knowing absolutely that, on a direct vote, the bill would pass the House, they saw one mode, and only one, of defeating it—the Crittenden-Montgomery amendment, which proposed to admit Kansas into the Union, with the Lecompton Constitution, provided the People, on a fair vote, should adopt it, or should they reject, to enable them to form another Constitution. There were twenty-eight members of the House, not Republicans, some of whom had no objection to the introduction of Slavery into Kansas, provided the People were in favor of it, but who believed that the Constitution was the offspring of fraud, was not their voice, and ought to be submitted to them: and some of whom, while hostile to Slavery, still maintain that the right of a People forming a State Constitution to adopt or reject it, ought not to be questioned: these, too, holding that the instrument was one of fraud, and had been adopted in disregard of the will of the People, demanded its submission to a fair vote. The Republicans, not agreeing with either class, in respect to the power of Congress over Slavery, not admitting that it was right for any Territory to establish the system, but only that in a certain condition, agreed with them that the Constitution was a fraud, and was adverse to the will of the great majority of the People of Kansas.

What was to be done? Co-operating with these classes, they could defeat the bill, and prevent the Lecompton Constitution and Slavery from being fastened on Kansas. To refuse to co-operate, was to allow the bill to pass, and Kansas to be a Slave State under a Constitution which recognises in most odious terms the right of property in human beings.

The Public knew their position and purposes—their record was too plain to be misunderstood. Could they co-operate without sacrificing their policy, their great aim—the exclusion of Slavery from Kansas? If they voted for the amendment, the bill as amended would go back to the Senate, and they knew that it would not pass there. But, should it pass, the People of Kansas were to be trusted. We all knew that the opponents of Lecompton and Slavery were in the absolute ascendant there, and would do what the Republican members of Congress could not, vote them both down. Well might they trust Popular Sovereignty, when it was notorious that four-fifths of the Popular Sovereigns were Republican or Free State voters! In either contingency, then, their great Cause was safe.

They voted for the amendment—the amendment did kill the bill—and the upshot of the matter is, that at last the Administration Party itself is driven to give to the People of Kansas an opportunity to vote down the miserable Constitution, and vote themselves a free State, although the form of submission is such that it only brings disgrace upon that Party.

The Freedom-loving People of the country are this have pronounced their judgment upon this act of Republicans—"well done, good and faithful servants!" In a minority in both Houses, their persevering energy and practical sagacity have been more than a match for the Slavery Propaganda, and have virtually defeated their attempt, backed up by a servile Administration, to fasten Slavery upon Kansas. This was the *purpose* of their vote on the Crittenden amendment—this is the *effect*: the vote really needs no other vindication.

Had they refused to give it, the bill to admit Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution would have become Law; ere this, United States troops would have been summoned to the field to enforce the infernal iniquity, at the point of the bayonet, on a resisting People, and upon the Republican members of Congress would have rested a part of the blood-guiltiness of the horrible conflict, because, when they had the power to prevent it, they refused to exert it.

Hitherto we have addressed ourselves to the common sense of the People; but we have a word or two for the few who permit themselves to be perplexed by metaphysical subtilties. Surely, they say, the Republicans, in voting to submit to the judgment of the People of Kansas the Slave Constitution of Lecompton, admitted their right to ratify it, or, in the language of Dr. Cheever, "that the right to enslave is an elementary, native, intrinsic right of Popular Sovereignty."

Surely, they did no such thing. *Power* and *Right* are not convertible terms. For reasons satisfactory to myself, I may invest my son, before he is of age, with the *power* to act for himself—to decide upon his own course of life—but it does not follow that I invest him with a *right*, or admit any *right* in him, to act dishonorably, or adopt an immoral course of life. God has made man a free agent—given him the *power* to choose or reject good or evil, but he has not given him the *right* to reject the good and choose the evil. Colonel Benton held, and other eminent statesmen have held, that the Constitution of the United States does not extend to the Territories of the Union—that the Federal Government has supreme *power* over them, there being no constitutional restraint upon this power. Admit for a moment that the view is correct, would it follow that the Federal Government has the *right* to do *injustice, to practice oppression, to establish Slavery*, in the Territories? It would have the *power*, not the *right*. In voting for the Crittenden-Montgomery amendment, the Republicans voted to give the People of Kansas the *power* to choose or refuse evil, but they did not admit their *right* to choose evil. They could not impart what they did not possess—could not admit what they had utterly repudiated as an impossibility. You did not object to investing Minnesota with a State organization—but the People of Minnesota may now call a Convention, and amend their Constitution so as to tolerate Slavery and exclude free colored persons. They have the power, as a State, to do so; you have aided in conferring it upon them; they abuse it; are you responsible? Did you give them the *right* to abuse it? Did you *admit* that they would have such a *right*? "Oh—but you *say*, we had no reason to believe that they would act in that way, every reason to believe that they would not." Very good. So had the Republican members of Congress every reason to believe that the People of Kansas would do right and reject Slavery, and no reason to believe that they would do otherwise. Having no power to save that People from the curse of Slavery, but being able to secure to them the power to save themselves, and having every reason to believe that, if conferred, it would be used for that purpose, and knowing that, if they did not confer it, Slavery would be fastened upon them, they voted them the power; but they never voted them the right to do wrong, or admitted such a right—for they are neither fools nor Atheists.

TUESDAY IN CONGRESS.

In the Senate, Mr. Douglas called up the Oregon bill, and it was discussed, Mr. Trumbull, of Illinois, leading off in the debate.

The House proceeded at once, after the reading of the journal, to the election of a Doorkeeper. Mr. Joseph C. Wright, the Democratic candidate, received 117 votes; Mr. Fletcher, the Republican candidate, 77; Mr. Chase, American, 10; Walker, American, 9. There were three scattering votes. Every Douglas Democrat, except Mr. Harris, voted for the regular Democratic candidate. Mr. Wright had a majority of *eight* over all his competitors, and was duly sworn into office.

A bill to prevent frauds in land titles in California was then passed.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole upon the appropriation bills.

☞ A speech, by Lewis Tappan, of New York, concerning the Tract Society, has been forwarded to us for publication. It will be inserted in our next.

WASHINGTON ITEMS.

The Turkish Vice Admiral has declined the offer of a passage home on the Wabash.

Twelve hundred thousand of land warrants were issued last month under the bounty act of 1855. Twenty-eight million acres of land will be necessary to satisfy these warrants.

The Willett's Point investigating committee are drawing their labors to a close. The owner of the property, it appears, gave the Government the refusal of it up to a certain time (April, 1857) for $130,000; but as the appropriation for the purchase was not available until the 1st of July, the owner in the mean time sold it to Mr. Irwin, who subsequently disposed of it to the Government for $200,000, the engineer department having reported it as the most available site for fortifications. Nothing has been elicited to show that the Secretary of War was concerned in any collusion or complicity in the purchase.

The President has removed his United States District Attorney for Kansas, Mr. Wier, and appointed in his stead Mr. Allison Davis. Mr. Wier is a Free-State Democrat. Mr. Davis is a Slave-State Lecompton Democrat. This act, consummated, as it is, after the passage of the English bill, shows the intention of Mr. Buchanan. He will not give the people of Kansas a fair election, if he can help it. This act, we trust, will seal the fate of the Buchanan party in every free State.

CALIFORNIA.—We are glad to see, by our California papers, that the slave Archy Lee was set free in the Circuit Court at San Francisco. It was a just decision.

We are sorry to notice that a bill has been presented to the California Legislature, prohibiting further immigration of negroes to that State, and requiring those at present in California to take out licenses. The colored people are very much excited, and talk of emigrating in a body to British territory.

The *Courrier des Etats Unis* is of opinion that the Paraguay resolution is meant for a precedent, to be followed by similar action in respect to Cuba.

The Lederer.

History of the Origin, Formation, and Adoption, of the Constitution of the United States; with Notices of its Principal Framers. By George Ticknor Curtis. In Two Volumes. Volume II. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1858. For sale by Taylor & Maury, Washington, D. C.

The *first* volume of this work we have not received, and can therefore only speak of it from that which is now before us. This is a most valuable one for the condensed information it contains, and the subject ought to give it a wide circulation. Kent and Story have furnished their Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, Webster and many others of our statesmen, Marshall, and high-minded upright Judges like him, have expounded its principles and applied them to emergent cases. Such a history of its origin, development, and adoption, however, is what every citizen should become acquainted with. It is a faithful record of events, and evidently has cost its author much research. He sets down facts not as a partisan, indulges in no mere reflections of his own, but, as his aim requires, draws from the best original sources his statements of facts illustrative alike of the feelings and acts of those who were engaged with more or less of influence in bringing about the results.

The author's plan, in the present volume, as given by himself, is thus clearly defined: "I shall consider questions of construction only so far as may be necessary to elucidate my subject; for I propose, in writing the history of the formation of the Constitution, to describe rather those great modifications in the principles and structure of the union that took place in the period at which we have now arrived in the course of this work, to state the essential features of the new Government, and to trace the process by which they were evolved from the elements to which the framers of that Government resorted." This plan he keeps closely in view, and the eminent ability with which he executes it, every one who reads the book must admit.

Sixteen chapters, embracing nearly 500 pages, are devoted to the formation of the Constitution, presenting a view of the preparation and plans and objects and reports of committees, and discussions in the Convention—thus condensing a great amount of detailed information in a moderate compass, and accessible to the people at large.

The last hundred pages record the struggles in different States for its ratification, showing that it was indeed a hard-fought battle, on almost every field where the victory was finally won. In the course of this history, too much light is thrown on the causes of the difficulties which opposed the Union of the States, and the means by which they were removed.

Mr. Curtis has performed a service for which the country owes him thanks, by enabling all better to understand the views of the great men by whom the Constitution was framed and set in operation. Especially desirable is such knowledge now, when the great principles on which it is based are wrested to the purposes of despotic authority, and the liberties of the people are subverted under the guise of adherence to its intent, and the end and aim of those honored men is frustrated by a power, of whose strength they could not have dreamed, and which they would have resisted to the death. The Constitution itself, with its amendments to it, is given in full in an appendix, and the volume is likewise furnished with a copious index to the whole work.

A Compendium of American Literature, Chronologically Arranged with Biographical Sketches of the Authors, on the Plan of the Author's "Compendium of English Literature" and "English Literature of the Nineteenth Century." By Charles D. Cleveland. Philadelphia: E. C. & J. Biddle. 1858.

The author, in his preface, says: "Every one will look at the subject from a different standpoint; and I will sincerely thank each and all to place me in their position, that I may as far as possible see with their eyes." We fear that the experiment suggested would result too much like that in the old fable of the man who tried to please everybody, and pleased nobody, and so wisely concluded at last to please himself. There is probably no one who takes up this volume but must feel that some authors are left out and others are put in, some passages are selected and others passed over, in the case of those who occupy a place in this list, that, had he had the making of it, would have been different. We could mention such names and references. A national literature, in our view, is that which *permanently* represents the mind and character of a nation. This is what we mean by Grecian and Roman literature. The number of authors in a list described in a *history* of a national literature will of course be great. That of Germany, for instance, volumes could not contain it. And yet there could scarcely be any doubt as to the great names whose writings will go down to posterity with an enduring fame.

It is on such a basis as we believe a volume like this should be constructed, and, adopting this as the true standard, while we recognise its application in many cases, we think Mr. Cleveland has sometimes certainly lost sight of it. Adventitious circumstances thus have, in certain instances, given a place to individuals who, as thus brought into this company, might be much as the politicians which Burke speaks of in Lord Chatham's administration—wondering how or why they have been so associated. Still, the volume is an interesting collection of extracts, and contains many rich *morceaux* of the productions of minds and genius that will ever be blended with the fame of our country in its most enduring title to respect and honor in after ages. There are about 110 authors, of whom biographical sketches and extracts are furnished, embracing names in the varied classes and professions of both sexes. Generally, the chronological arrangement is adopted, though we think not strictly adhered to. Mr. Cleveland's book deserves well of the friends of an outspoken testimony for human rights.

The Happy Home. By Kirwan, author of "Letters to Bishop Hughes," "Romanism at Home," "Men and Things in Europe," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1858. For sale by Taylor & Maury, Washington, D. C.

Few of our readers probably need to be told who Kirwan is. Dr. Nicholas Murray is too well known by the publications which have been so widely circulated under his assumed name to require vouchers of his capacity to instruct the public on such topics as he may select for the exercise of his pen. There is much good sense in this little volume. It treats especially of education, and the author considers it under the branches of physical, moral, mental, and religious training, both of sons and daughters. Many of his remarks are highly suggestive. All are given in a plain, clear style, making no pretension to fine writing, but not unfrequently interspersed with passages of eloquent description, and abounding with illustrations drawn alike from his own observation and from a mind richly stored with the fruits of a diligent use of books. Great principles are laid down, and their bearing exhibited on the family and society at large.

The New York Pulpit in the Revival of 1858. A Memorial Volume of Sermons. New York: Published by Sheldon, Blakeman, & Co. Sold by William Ballantyne, Washington. 1 vol., pp. 368.

These discourses were not composed for publication, but are selected from sermons delivered during the present revival. They are all admirable, and this volume richly merits wide popularity. The eminent talent of New York and Brooklyn is here exhibited. Among these twenty five sermons, we have those of Dr. Alexander, Dr. Bethune, Dr. William Adams, and one from Dr. William R. Williams, who who is a distinguished representative of the ministerial talent of our country. It is only to be regretted the Christian public see so little from his beautiful pen. This sermon alone is worth the cost of the book.

The Christian Examiner for May.

This admirable periodical is always welcome. This number contains six articles, each of which is full of talent, learning, and interest. The "Ideal Girlhood of Modern Romance" is a charming essay. "The Oriental Question" is penned by one well posted with the great questions of European politics.

Harper's New Monthly, for June, 1858.

Harper again. So early, too. Is it a good number? What does he give us now? Very natural inquiries. Let us see. First, "The City of Elms," New Haven, with a variety of illustrations and records—some old, some new, some humorous, and some more grave, of its origin, progress, and present state; then, "Tropical Journeyings—California," full, too, of pictures—Portobello, Aspinwall, Panama, negroes, hucaneers, scorpions, centipedes, bats, vampire, and a dash at the other inhabitants, tree growth, and historical, biographical, and descriptive notices; then, "The Microscope," a shorter article, with its illustrations of a number of subjects; "Dear Hunting;" "Old and New Style;" "Our Sons;" "Esther Bennett's Love and Hate;" "A Night Scene," poetry *indeed*, by William Cullen Bryant; "A Nest of Cavaliers;" "An Incident at Niagara Falls;" "In Articulo Mortis;" "A Mother's Confession;" Another portion, four chapters, of Thackeray's "The Virginians," in which he introduces Lord Chesterfield, Dr. Johnson, Samuel Richardson, and Henry Fielding, and others, the wits and authors of that day; "Monthly Record;" "Literary Notices;" "Editor's Table' Easy Chair, Drawer;" the Comic Illustrations, viz: "Mr. Flasher's Love at First sight;" "Fashions for June," &c.

NEW BOOKS.

The *Atlantic Monthly* has a circulation already of 30,000 copies per month. This is doing pretty well, when we consider that it is in its politics strongly anti-Slavery.

Beecher's "Life Thoughts," when out but twenty days, had sold 16,000 copies—a very fine sale.

Sheldon, Blakeman, & Co., of New York, the publishers of Spurgeon's sermons, have already sold 150,000 volumes of the series.

Mr. Dayton, publisher of "Fifty Years in Chains," an Anti-Slavery story, has sold five thousand copies in a short time.

It is very evident, from these and a multiplicity of similar facts, that the book trade is reviving, after its long and heavy depression.

OREGON.—The Republicans held a State Convention at Salem, in Oregon, on the second of April, and nominated—

For Governor, John Denny.

For Representative in Congress, J. R. McBride.

For Secretary of State, Leander Holmes.

For State Printer, D. W. Craig.

For State Treasurer, E. E. Applegate.

The Democrats are in the midst of a severe fight, and two sets of nominations have been made. It is thought, however, that they will, after a time, unite again, as they are not divided by a principle. It is possible that one wing may hereafter unite with the Republicans, and deliver the State from the government of the Sham Democracy, in case Oregon comes into the Union.

THE NORTH AND SOUTH.—We have received the first number of a neat-looking weekly sheet with this title. It hails from New Britain, Connecticut, and is owned and edited by the well-known Elihu Burritt. New Britain is his residence and native place. This new journal will be the advocate of Mr. Burritt's scheme of compensating the slaveholders of the South for their slave property, and thus ridding the country of the peculiar institution. Mr. Burritt will aim to make the paper what his former journal—the *Christian Citizen*—was, and we wish him all success in his new enterprise.

☞ The Tract Society, as our readers will see in our news columns, has voted to sustain its Publishing Committee in refusing to publish one word respecting the duties of masters to their slaves. They do publish upon the duties *of slaves to masters*—but that is quite a different matter! The end is not yet. This great institution will not be permitted to ally itself with Wrong. Either the Society will be revolutionized, or the great body of contributors will leave it, and form a new one.

☞ The Anti-Slavery friends of the Tract Society held a preliminary meeting last week, Tuesday, in New York. Mr. Lewis Tappan addressed the meeting in favor of the Society's assuming a radical position in reference to Slavery. He wanted the Society in its tracts to oppose Slavery *as a sin*, instead of regulating the conduct of slaveholders, as if the relation were proper. Rev. Dr. Cheever upheld this view of the matter, but Dr. Thompson of the *Independent*, Rev. Mr. Patton of Chicago, Dr. Hawes, and others, contended that to take this ground now would weaken the position of the Anti-Slavery friends of the Society. So it was agreed that the conduct of the Publishing Committee should be condemned, and the action of the Society a year ago sustained—action which instructed the Committee to publish tracts showing the duties of masters to their slaves, nothing being said upon the *relation* itself.

☞ The enemies of Col. Forney and his *Press*, despairing of success in opposing his course on Lecompton by legitimate arguments, now try to injure him by charging that Dr. Elder edits the *Press*. If Dr. Elder is one of the corps of writers engaged by the *Press*, he probably writes only what Col. Forney chooses to adopt. Col. Forney owns the *Press*, and publishes only what he likes, as a matter of course. The chief editor of the London *Times* never writes a line, but gathers editorial matter from all parts of the Kingdom for his journal. Let the chagrined opponents of the *Press* answer its arguments, and be not quite so deeply anxious about the authorship of its editorials, and they will excite more admiration than they possibly can in their present attitude.

PARAGUAY.—The *Springfield Republican* states in a few words the causes for the dispute with Paragnay about which the Senate had some discussion:

"There are three principal causes of complaint against Paraguay. In 1855, our exploring steamer, the Water Witch, commanded by Capt Page, was ascending the Paraguay river, when it was fired into from a fort, by order of President Lopez, and one of her men killed. The further progression of the expedition was thus prevented. Afterward, Consul Hopkins—son of Bishop Hopkins, of Vermont—was insulted and finally sent home by Lopez. Several others of our citizens were driven out of the country, their business broken up, and their property destroyed. The Government of Paraguay has also behaved in an unreasonable and insulting manner in reference to a treaty negotiated with our Government. After once acceding to the treaty, she now declines to ratify it, on the pretext that it has been changed by our Government, when the truth is that the only changes have been a few verbal corrections, not at all affecting a single provision of the treaty. The Government of Paraguay is evidently inclined to be ugly and insolent. A little wholesome correction would do her good, and we are the more willing to see it administered, because in her case there is no temptation to seize territory by way of reprisals. Brazil has lately compelled her to settle a quarrel by a show of force, and doubtless the same means will prove effectual in regard to our own Government.

"Paraguay is enclosed between the Parana and Paraguay rivers, and has an area of about 84,000 square miles, and a population of about 300,000, chiefly half-civilized Indians. It is an interior country, nearly a thousand miles distant from the ocean, and, although the Parana is navigable, can never be of great importance commercially."

THE ADMINISTRATION PARTY AT WORK.—The "Keystone Club" of this city, which is composed chiefly of Government employés, has ordered *one million* of documents for distribution in the single State of Pennsylvania.

The Indiana Democratic Club, at a meeting held a week or two since, subscribed *six hundred dollars* for a like purpose in the State of Indiana.

H. W. Herbert, Esq., author, shot himself, in New York, on Monday, at the Stevens House. The cause was family trouble.

THE SUSQUEHANN

THIRTY-FIFTH CONGRESS,

FIRST SESSION.

Friday, May 14, 1858.

SENATE.

A resolution of inquiry was introduced by Mr. Bright, calling for any information or correspondence relative to the alleged seizure or search of American vessels by foreign armed cruisers in the Gulf of Mexico or the adjacent waters.

The Senators from the new State of Minnesota drew lots for the Senatorial class to which they should be respectively assigned, the result of which was, that Mr. Shields drew the term expiring on the 3d of March, 1859, and Mr. Rice the term expiring on the 3d of March, 1863.

Mr. Rice offered a resolution asking for the appointment of a special committee to investigate the charges made against him by certain citizens of Iowa. The consideration of the resolution was postponed in consequence of the absence of Mr. Harlan, the Senator through whom the charges had been preferred.

The Senate then proceeded to take up the private calendar, and spent the residue of the day's session in the discussion of private bills.

HOUSE.

The day was devoted to private bills, a number of which were reported and passed. The private calendar was then taken up, and considerable progress was made upon it, when, at half past four o'clock, the House found itself without quorum. A call of the House was then ordered, the proceedings under which occupied its attention until half past eleven o'clock, when an adjournment took place.

Saturday, May 15, 1858.

SENATE.

The day had been assigned by previous resolution to the consideration of business relating to the District of Columbia; and, after some debate as to the priority of business, (Mr. Hunter desiring to call up the bill regarding appropriation hill,) it was decided by the Senate to adhere to the original order, devoting the day to legislation for the District.

Several bills were considered, debated, and passed, among the most important of which were a bill for the enforcement of mechanics' liens on buildings, &c., in the District of Columbia, a bill for the benefit of public schools in the city of Washington, and a bill authorizing the organization of a fire department in the District.

The only one of these measures which gave rise to much debate was that in relation to the public schools of Washington. Mr. Johnson, of Tennessee, moved to strike out from the bill the section authorizing the payment from the Treasury of the United States of any sum not more than twenty thousand dollars to the support of public schools in this city, provided the same sum shall be raised by the corporation of Washington for the same purpose. He opposed this grant, on the ground of its imputed unconstitutionality. The Congress of the United States had no right, in his opinion, to appropriate the money of the National Treasury for the education of children in this District.

Mr. Brown zealously defended the provision, on the ground that it was the duty of the Federal Government, as the largest property holder in the city, to contribute to the maintenance of common schools in the same. It was calculated that the value of the public buildings in the city was about equal to that of all the private property in Washington, and it was therefore just and proper that the Government should bear an equal share in the burden of supporting an educational system.

Messrs. Wilson, Seward, and Crittenden, also defended the constitutionality and propriety of the measure. Mr. Toombs opposed it from considerations of expediency, without entertaining the question of constitutional power, which he thought more than doubtful. Mr. Gwin also briefly argued against the allowance of the grant.

The motion to strike out the section, being put to vote at the conclusion of the debate, was lost—yeas 13, nays 26. After which, the bill was read a third time and passed.

The resolution directing an inquiry into the truth of certain allegations made by citizens of Iowa against Mr. Rice, a Senator from the State of Minnesota, was called up during the session of Saturday, and the whole subject referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

At four o'clock, the Senate proceeded to hold an Executive session.

HOUSE.

Mr. R. W. Latham, of this city, whose arrest had been ordered for disobeying a summons to appear as a witness before one of the investigating committees, was arraigned, and ordered to be discharged, upon his appearing and testifying before the committee. The several private bills reported from the Committee of the Whole on Friday were passed, except a bill for the relief of the city of Carondelet, Missouri, which was rejected. A motion was submitted to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the further consideration of one of the memorials asking for the impeachment of Judge Watrous, of Texas: but no action was had on the subject. The hill to refund to certain merchants of New York the duties on goods destroyed by fire in 1845 was further considered, and finally laid on the table, by yeas 96, nays 91. The House adjourned at a quarter past four o'clock.—*National Intelligencer.*

Monday, May 17, 1858.

SENATE.

Mr. Seward submitted the following resolution, and asked its present consideration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be instructed to inquire whether any legislation is necessary to enable the President of the United States to protect American vessels against British aggression in the Gulf of Mexico or elsewhere, and to report by hill or otherwise.

This resolution merely instructed the committee to inquire whether any additional legislation was necessary; because, if so, it should at once be considered, as the session was drawing to a close. These aggressions were becoming intolerable; already it would seem, eleven of our vessels have been detained, and, in some way, fired into by British cruisers.

Mr. Mason said that he had no further information on this subject, save what was delivered from the newspapers of the day, which was not of such a character as would warrant the Senate to act in the matter. If the facts were as had been stated, they would indeed involve matters for very grave inquiry. He would prefer that the resolution lie over.

The resolution was laid over under the rule.

The special order of the day was the hill making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending the 30th of June, 1859, which had been reconsidered on Thursday last, on motion of Mr. Doolittle, for the purpose of introducing an amendment granting the usual extra compensation to the reporters of the Senate. The debate on the propriety of this proposition was resumed and participated in by Messrs. Toombs, Brown, Shields, Johnson of Arkansas, Pugh, Stuart, Mason, Davis, Fessenden, Hunter, Simmons, Trumbull, Bell, and others.

At the conclusion of the discussion, which embraced the whole range of Congressional reporting, its expense, nature of the contract under which it is executed, &c., the amendment allowing compensation to the reporters of the Senate was adopted; after which, a motion to strike out the whole section containing this appropriation for the benefit of the reporters in both branches of Congress was rejected—yeas 20, nays 31.

A motion still further to amend the hill, by inserting an appropriation for two assistants, to be appointed by the Attorney General, to serve in his office, was lost, after a brief debate; and the hill, being again put upon its passage, was carried.

The Senate then proceeded, on motion of Mr. Slidell, to the consideration of Executive business.

HOUSE.

The Admission of New States.—Mr. Quitman, of Mississippi, asked leave to introduce a joint resolution concerning the admission of new States into the Union, as follows:

Resolved, &c., That hereafter no new States formed out of the Territories of the United States shall be admitted into the Union until it shall have been ascertained by a census, taken by authority of Congress, that the Territory seeking admission contains a fixed population equal to the number required for a Representative in Congress, according to the ratio then existing; nor until the people of such Territory shall have been authorized by act of Congress to hold a Convention and to form a Constitution, and shall have presented the same for admission into the Union, in pursuance of said permission, and in accordance with the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Kelsey, of New York, objected.

Mr. Quitman moved a suspension of the rules.

Mr. Washburn, of Maine, called for the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and resulted—yeas 89, nays 87.

So the rules were not suspended, two-thirds not voting for the motion. The motion was voted for by the Administration and South Americans, against by the Republicans.

Expulsion of the Doorkeeper.—The House proceeded, as the regular order of business, to consider the report of the Committee on Accounts, charging malpractices against the Doorkeeper, and recommending the passage of the following resolution:

Resolved, That R. B. Hackney, Doorkeeper of the present House of Representatives, he and he is hereby dismissed forthwith from that office.

After several attempts to postpone the subject, and to give the Doorkeeper a further hearing, the resolution was adopted—yeas 161, nays 34.

Resolutions were then passed, regulating the compensation of the Doorkeeper and his subordinates.

Mr. Morris, of Pennsylvania, offered a resolution instructing the Committee of Ways and Means to report upon the expediency of revising the present tariff, and augmenting the duties on articles of domestic manufacture, so as to afford increased protection to American industry. The vote on suspending the rules for the introduction of the resolution was—yeas 96, nays 101.

The Republicans generally voted for suspending the rules, willing to grant an inquiry into the subject. The Administration party voted against it. The House soon after adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

May 13, 1858.

Latest from Kansas.

A message from Fort Scott reached Lawrence on the 3d, giving a distressing account of the outrages on the Free-State men. One was brought into the fort on the 28th of April, and sentenced to be shot. Eight ruffians took him to the timber, and drew lots to see who should commit the deed. It fell on Brockett, when he deliberately shot him dead, for no offence but *his opinion*. Judge Williams had broken up the district court, not daring to have Free-State men on the there. Two of the United States soldiers have been found guilty of joining the Pro-Slavery guerillas to scour the country at night. Eight eager hordes of Free-State settlers had left the Little Osage Valley in one company, in consequence of the insecurity of life and property, and nearly all the settlers there, of all parties, had left. They tell horrible tales of their sufferings. Mapleton, the settlement of the Vermont Colony, is nearly deserted. Men are shot down in cold blood without provocation, and all the horrors of the Shannon war are now felt by that distracted neighborhood. On the other hand, the correspondent of the *Missouri Republican* gives an account of the proceedings of Lane's committee of safety at Fort Scott, which ordered certain Pro-Slavery men to leave the territory on pain of death. One of the resolutions of the committee was, that Captain Anderson shall be hanged upon the highest tree in Bourbon county, and every soldier he put death, wherever he may be found."

Another letter in the *Republican* says that "the Democracy of Kansas are to unite with the conservative, anti-nigger Free-Soilers, and kill the Leavenworth bastard on the 18th inst., when the people are to vote upon its acceptance." He predicts that the Leavenworth Constitution will be overwhelmingly defeated. This is not good authority, but probably the best thing for Kansas, under present circumstances, is to reject the Leavenworth as well as the Lecompton Constitution, and remain a Territory until her people can settle down into a more correct view of what they do want, and then carry it through in a regular and legitimate manner. The Leavenworth Constitution has a taint of irregularity about it, in consequence of the criminal delay of the act authorizing it in the Territorial Legislature, which was too busy and speculative in town lots to attend to its appropriate business.

Money brings a high price in Kansas. The Lawrence *Republican*, fears its veracity will be questioned when it says, "we have seen five, ten, and fifteen per cent. per month paid for money, loaned on good real estate securities; and we are reliably informed that some very conscientious sharks have lately refused to loan at less than twenty per cent. per month, and have even realized that per cent. in some cases."

THE RIFLEMEN OF THE WEST.

From Vol. VII of Benton's Abridgment of the Debates of Congress.

Mr. Benton stopped a moment to speak of an exploit too little known to history. He said that the British and Indians, to the number of 1,600, appeared before Fort Pitt in the year 1780. General George Rogers Clark was then upon the American Bottom, with the conquerors of Vincennes and Kaskaskia. The French of St. Louis sent to invoke his aid. He had but 400 men, and might have declined with honor. He might have said: Our numbers are too few, the river is too wide and rapid; you are strangers, and live beyond the confines of my country; you may be in collusion with the enemy, to draw me across the Mississippi, and to revenge in Louisiana the defeat of your countrymen in Illinois. But such was not the language of General Clark, nor of the 400 brave men who followed his steps. He or they knew not danger. Knew it not! May their spirits pardon me, said Mr. Benton, for applying to them such a fourth-of-July expression. They did know danger—were born in its presence, and grew up in its company—and each could say, with Cæsar—

> "Danger and I are brothers,
> Twin lions whelped in one hour,
> And I the elder and more cruel!"

They were the riflemen of the West, and took counsel, not from danger, but from honor and courage. They divided into two bodies, and marched to the town of St. Louis. Five hundred presented themselves opposite the town, and two hundred crossed the river below. At the sight of such boldness, the British and Indians, believing them to be the vanguard of a great army, fled with precipitation. Eighty of the inhabitants, and leaving an impression of terror which still marks that year as an epoch of calamity; a *"Année du coup."* History continued Mr. B., tells of the passage of the Rubicon by Cæsar, and of the Alps by Hannibal as much in heroism and magnanimity as the Father of Floods surpasses in magnitude the puny streams of Gaul and of Asia Minor.

EXCITING MEETING OF THE AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY.

Defiant of the Northern Fanatics.

The New York papers are filled with accounts of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the American Tract Society, which met in that city on Wednesday, in the Reformed Dutch Church, Lafayette Place. About two thousand persons, from various sections of the Union, were admitted by ticket, showing the great interest taken in the question at issue—whether or not the executive committee were justified in suppressing or suspending the publication of the tract "The Duties of Masters," alleged to have been offensive to the people of the South, especially slaveholders. The publication of this tract was commenced under a resolution adopted at the last annual meeting, looking to the discussion of the moral aspect of Slavery. Soon after the opening of the meeting—over which Chief Justice Williams, of Conn., presided—Rev. Dr. Adams made a report, justifying the executive committee.

The Rev. Dr. Magee made a few remarks. Two truths were involved in the committee, and these considerations had governed them. Had they published the tract to which reference had been made, they would have dismembered the Society. That was one conclusion at which they had arrived, and the evidence upon which it was based was not and could not be so well appreciated by those who had not their opportunity of judging it. They did fully believe it. Another was, that a large majority of the friends of the Society were not prepared to adopt a course which should thus result. A farther and equally plain consideration was, that it was useless to publish a tract addressed to masters, which would have but a small circulation in the South, among those to whom it was addressed, and which in the North was not needed. They had decided not to mix the American Tract Society with the great exciting question. This was their simple decision.

The matter was then recommitted to them, and in judging it he hoped they had sought the grace of God, and would act under his guidance. Great interests were at stake. Should they adopt a course which would separate them from fifteen States, and compel the Executive to a field where their labors were most called for? Such were the views of the committee. [Hisses and applause.]

The President hoped there would be no demonstrations of approval or dissent, as this was not a political meeting.

Bishop McIlvaine moved that the action of the committee he sustained, and made a long speech.

Prof. Crosby read from a tract, entitled "Sambo and Tony," in which slaves are counselled not to go from plantation to plantation, and to obey their masters, and asked if the Society published it.

There was confusion, and cries of "order!" Dr. William Adams said the tract was published twenty years ago.

Dr. Tyng attempted to get the floor, amid cries of "order!" Dr. Tyng, "Let 'em answer the question!" &c.

Order being restored, Dr. Tyng spoke in favor of the resolution of the Society which admitted the discussion of the moral aspects of Slavery to be a legitimate subject for the Society to discuss, and moved to lay Bishop McIlvaine's motion on the table, in order that a resolution reaffirming that position be affirmed.

Dr. Tyng's motion was voted upon *viva voce*, and the Chairman said it was lost. A division was called for, and the affirmative was counted; but when the negative arose, it so largely preponderated that a count was deemed unnecessary.

Much excitement prevailed. Some called for a count; others declared that the motion was lost, ten to one; and the members of the committee displayed many symptoms of delight.

There was a long delay and great confusion. A gentleman's count was made; but order was finally so far restored that Judge Jessup attempted to move an amendment to Bishop McIlvaine's motion, but was interrupted by loud calls for the previous question in all parts of the house, and another scene of tumult followed. Several of the majority declared that it was not fair to choke off discussion.

Judge Jessup read his amendment, reaffirming the resolution of last year, which was declared out of order.

Dr. Bethune protested that it was not unanimous. He was requested to say for Dr. Spring that he did not vote for it, and he (Bethune) did not.

Doctor Thompson. Did either of you vote against it?

Bethune. No. [Laughter.]

Thompson. Then there was no vote against it, and it was unanimous.

Dr. Bethune said that, at the meeting last year, he was asked by Dr. Thompson to second the resolution, but refused to do it. He thought that anything coming from the chief editor of the *Independent* was to be regarded with suspicion, and would be treated his approval.

Laughter, hisses, cries of "Order!" and general confusion followed. Judge Jessup at last got the floor, and said it was vain for gentlemen to say that the action of the society last year was not unanimous. The fact is, one or two, or fifty, might not have concurred, did not change the fact that there was no dissenting voice, and that the resolution meant but as the unanimous sentiment of this society. He went on to defend the resolution of that resolution, and deprecated the idea of receding from it, as a measure which would open the floodgates of agitation, and disturb again the peace of the society.

Dr. Bethune got the floor at the close of Judge Jessup's remarks. A scene of confusion followed, and there were, for several minutes, mingled cries of "Bethune," "Question," and "Order."

Rev. Dr. Bacon then got the floor, and made a warm Anti-Slavery speech, and was followed by the Rev. Dr. Bethune, on the opposite side, in a powerful and affecting speech. He deprecated the idea of no fellowship with slaveholders; for that was excommunicating them from the Church of God, and thus the unhappy South were prevented from having the gospel. He thought the devil never instituted a scheme so truly malignant as this to prevent the spread of the gospel. Cannibals in Africa, the natives of Congo, all would have the gospel preached to them, but the extreme men of the North would first deny them the gospel, and then deny them the tract. What, then, was to become of these millions? Were they to be permitted to go down to hell, because these extreme people willed it? God forbid.

Rev. Mr. Thompson (editor of *Independent*) offered an amendment accepting the statements of the publishing committee, but ordering a tract to be published on the duties of masters. After Dr. Thompson's speech, the society agreed to take a vote at three P. M. The remainder of the speeches occupied the hour from two till three.

Prof. Howard Crosby offered a resolution that "no tract bearing on the history of slavery should be published, and that the tract called Sambo and Toby be suppressed."

Rev. Dr. Johns, of Baltimore, then spoke five minutes, saying that he should return home, assuring his friends that the hearts of the members of the South and the North beat in union with theirs at the South. He said the Baltimore delegation came here not to discuss the Slavery question, but to vote for sustaining the action of the committee. He thought the North could not understand and consider evils at the South. The South could not intelligently do it, and just so it is impossible for the North to interfere with the evils relating peculiarly to the South. Dr. Johns further stated that he had refused a challenge to pay a legacy of $10,000 from a slaveholder.

Rev. Mr. Williams, of Baltimore, had the concluding five minutes. He would stand by the constitution of the society. If that is infringed, the South will withdraw entirely, leaving it to be the Northern, and not the American Tract Society. He contended for the right of the South to take care of its own children without interference.

When the hour for taking the question arrived, the amendment of Prof. Howard Crosby was first almost unanimously rejected.

The amendment of Rev. Dr. Thompson (*Independent*) was lost by a large majority.

The resolution of Bishop McIlvaine was carried, as follows, by a large majority:

Resolved, That the action of the executive committee be approved.

The protestants to the election of Bright and Fitch as United States Senators from Indiana are taking testimony under a resolution of the Senate, D. W. Voorhees and other Federal office-holders appearing for the hogus Senators.

LATER FROM CALIFORNIA.

New York, May 13.—The steamer Star of the West, with upwards of $1,600,000 in gold, arrived here this morning, from Aspinwall. Her advices from California are to the 20th ultimo.

The steamer Merrimac and sloop-of-war Decatur remained at Panama. All well.

Business at San Francisco was dull, but the mining and agricultural prospects of the State were eminently favorable.

Forrest, in Nevada county, California, has been burnt entirely.

Rich gold diggings have been discovered in Carson valley.

Later advices had been received from Lieut. Ives's expedition. He states that his exploration demonstrates the navigability of the Colorado river to the mouth of Virgin river.

Archy, the fugitive slave, has been discharged.

The Legislature of California has passed a bill prohibiting the future immigration of free negroes to California, compelling those already there to register their names and take out a license. The measure produced great excitement among them, and meetings were being held, in which they discussed the question of immigrating in a body to Vancouver's Island.

Advices from Oregon to the 8th of April had reached San Francisco. The Republicans had nominated John Denny, of Marion county, for Governor, and J. R. McBride for Congress. The Democrats had nominated Lafayette Grover for Congress.

The Sandwich Islands had made a new treaty with France.

News from the Isthmus announces that the Cass-Yrisarri treaty had passed the Senate of Granada in a slightly-modified form. There is talk of another revolution at Bogota.

Callao date to the 12th of April represent affairs quiet. Gen. Castilla had arrived at Arequipa, and was enthusiastically received.

The United States steamer Saranac left Valparaiso on the 3d ultimo, for Callao.

The sloop-of-war steamer Shubrick arrived at Panama on the 12th ultimo.

William Buckles, formerly of Baltimore, died in San Francisco, April 19th.

Col. Fremont had arrived in San Francisco.

Robert E. Woods, late Treasurer of San Francisco county, is dead.

LATER FROM EUROPE—ENGLISH SUCCESSES IN INDIA.

New York, May 11.—The steamer Persia, with Liverpool dates to the 1st instant, arrived here to-day. Her advices are three days later.

The steamer North Star, from New York, had not arrived out when the Persia sailed.

The steamer Glasgow arrived out on the 28th ultimo.

The news from India is quite interesting. Sir Colin Campbell invested Jhansi with three brigades on the 27th of March. The rebels, 12,000 strong, retired to the fort, and on the next day the bombardment was commenced. An attempt was made on the first of April, by 25,000 rebels, to raise the siege, but they were defeated, with the slaughter of 1,500 men, and the loss of all their guns and camp equipage. The town was stormed and taken on the 4th, and the fort occupied on the 6th, the rebels having 3,000 men killed in this conflict. Sir Brinkley Mcllvaine's motion on the table, in order that a resolution reaffirming that position be affirmed.

Dr. Tyng's motion was voted upon *viva voce*, and the Chairman said it was lost. A division was called for, and the affirmative was counted; but when the negative arose, it so largely preponderated that a count was deemed unnecessary.

Much excitement prevailed. Some called for a count; others declared that the motion was lost, ten to one; and the members of the committee displayed many symptoms of delight.

There was a long delay and great confusion. A gentleman's count was made; but order was finally so far restored that Judge Jessup attempted to move an amendment to Bishop Mcll

WASHINGTON, D. C.

ADMISSION OF MINNESOTA.

We present the record of the yeas and nays on the Senate bill admitting Minnesota as a State, passed in the House on the 11th.

Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, said: When he offered his amendment providing for three Representatives in Congress, he supposed Minnesota would be entitled to that number by her population; but subsequent information had changed his opinion. He, therefore, with the conclusion, withdraw his amendment, and insist upon the bill as it passed the Senate.

Mr. Garnett, of Virginia, then moved to amend the bill so as to provide for one Representative in Congress, instead of two.

Mr. Stephens called for the previous question; which was seconded, and the main question ordered.

Mr. Garnett called for the yeas and nays on agreeing to his amendment; which were ordered, and resulted—yeas 72, nays 117. So the amendment was rejected.

The question recurred on the substitute offered by Mr. Sherman, of Ohio, referring the Constitution back to a new Constitutional Convention, to be conformed to the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Mr. Sherman called for the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and resulted as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Anderson, Bingham, Blair, Chaffee, Clark of Conn, Clawson, Covode, Damrell, Davis of Maryland, Davis of Iowa, Dean, Dodd, Edie, Eustis, Foster, Garnett, Giddings, Gilmer, Granger, Harris of Maryland, Hill of Georgia, Horton, Kelsey, Kunkel of Pennsylvania, Marshall of Kentucky, Maynard, Morgan, Morris of Pennsylvania, Morse of Maine, Mott, Olin, Pettit, Purviance, Ready, Ricaud, Ruffin, Sandidge, Sherman of Ohio, Stanton, Trippe, Underwood, Wood son, and Zollicoffer—31.

Nays—Messrs. Abbott, Adrain, Andrews, Arnold, Atkins, Avery, Barbour, Bennett, Billinghurst, Bliss, Bocock, Bowie, Boyce, Branch, Bryan, Buffinton, Burlingame, Burnett, Burns, Campbell, Caskie, Chapman, Clark of Missouri, Clay, Cobb, John Cochrane of New York, Cockerill, Colfax, Comins, Covode, Cragin, Craig of Missouri, Craige of North Carolina, Crawford, Curry, Curtis, Davidson, Davis of Indiana, Davis of Mississippi, Dewart, Dimmick, Dowdell, Edmundson, Elliott, English, Eustis, Farnsworth, Faulkner, Fenton, Florence, Foley, Garnett, Gillis, Gilman, Goode, Goodwin, Greenwood, Gregg, Groesbeck, Grow, Harlan, Harris of Illinois, Haskin, Hatch, Hickman, Hill, Hoard, Hopkins, Houston, Howard, Huyler, Jackson, Jenkins, Jewett, Jones of Tennessee, J. Glancy Jones, Owen Jones, Kellogg, Kelley, Landy, Lawrence, Leach, Leidy, Leiter, Letcher, Lovejoy, Maclay, Mason, Matteson, Miller, Millson, Moore, Morris of Illinois, Morse of New York, Mott, Niblack, Nichols, Palmer, Parker, Pendleton, Peyton, Phelps, Phillips, Potter, Powell, Quitman, Reagan, Reilly, Ritchie, Russell, Sandidge, Savage, Scales, Scott, Shaw of Illinois, Shaw of North Carolina, Sickles, Singleton, Smith of Illinois, Smith of Tennessee, Smith of Virginia, Spinner, Stephens, Stevenson, Stewart of Maryland, Stewart of Pennsylvania, Tappan, Taylor of New York, Taylor of Louisiana, Thayer, Wade, Walbridge, Walker, Walbridge, Walton, Washburn of Illinois, Washburn of Maine, Watkins, White, Whiteley, Wilson, Winslow, Wood, Wortendyke, Wright of Georgia, and Wright of Tennessee—157.

Nays—Messrs. Anderson, Bingham, Blair, Clark of Connecticut, Clawson, Davis of Maryland, Davis of Iowa, Dean, Dodd, Edie, Eustis, Foster, Garnett, Giddings, Gilmer, Granger, Harris of Maryland, Hill of Georgia, Horton, Kelsey, Kunkel of Pennsylvania, Marshall of Kentucky, Maynard, Morgan, Morris of Pennsylvania, Morse of Maine, Olin, Ready, Ricaud, Robbins, Ruffin, Sherman of Ohio, Smith of Virginia, Stanton, Trippe, Underwood, Wood son, and Zollicoffer—36.

So the bill was passed.

From the New York Times.

THE KANSAS BILL PASSED.

The country can breathe again. Whatever may be their opinions of the Conference Kansas bill, we are confident that nine-tenths of the community will be glad to learn that it has been disposed of, and that Congress can now have a chance of attending to some other business. The bill passed the House yesterday by a vote of 112 to 103. All the Southern Democrats voted for it, and enough of the Anti-Lecompton Democrats to secure its passage. The most surprising vote given is probably that of Mr. Cox, of Ohio, who had very strongly pledged himself to vote for no bill which did not submit the Lecompton Constitution to the popular vote, and who yet did not venture to say that, in his judgment, this bill would have that effect. In fact, no Northern Democrat seems to have been willing to express such an opinion. The emphatic and decisive declarations of Stephens, Shorter, and one or two other Ultra Southern men, that it did *not* submit the question to the popular vote, seems to have so terrified those Northern gentlemen, that none of them ventured to hint an opposite view of the case. Upon their part, the proceeding, we must confess, was a very humiliating display of personal and political pusillanimity. We cannot doubt their feeling that the whole thing is thus submitted; and they will certainly take that ground when they come to face their constituents at home. What motive but cowardice, or a partisan subservience still more contemptible, should prevent their saying, as they must, that we cannot imagine. Our two Representatives, Messrs. Haskin and Clark, maintained their consistency and integrity to the last.

Our opinion of the bill itself has been frequently expressed. We think it *does* submit the Lecompton Constitution to the vote of the people of Kansas; and when the returns of the vote upon the land grant are received, we think the authors of the bill will concur in this opinion. The fact that it *may* not do so is undoubtful, or that there is room for a cavil or quibble on the subject, condemns the bill and brands its concoctors as tricksters and gamblers in politics, rather than men to be intrusted with the management of public affairs. Persons who, in the ordinary business of life, should resort to equivocations and phrases of questionable meaning, in order to entrap those with whom they are dealing, would have all which they would reject it fairly and openly presented, would be stained and distrusted forever after. It is one of the worst signs of the age, that a different morality prevails in political life, that the struggles of party are conducted upon principles which are despised on the race course, and that the lowest resorts of thimble-riggers and patent-safe operators must be explored to find a fitting parallel to the ordinary transactions of our highest National Councils. This bill is a sneaking, undignified, and disgraceful specimen of the worst kind of legislative legerdemain; and we have sufficient faith in the instincts of human nature to believe, that before many months, both its authors and its dupes will be heartily ashamed of it.

As a practical measure of legislation, it will amount to nothing. It simply postpones the final issue on the Kansas question. The land bribe will have no effect, for it gives the people nothing that they will not have in any event. Whenever, and under whatever Constitution, the State comes in, she will have public lands given her for her schools, university, and public buildings. This is never refused to any new State, and will not be refused to Kansas. This provision, therefore, is empty and worthless. It will not influence a hundred votes in Kansas. Nor will the threat of excluding the State for several years, if they do not vote for Lecompton, prove a whit more availing. It is a mere *brutum fulmen*, which binds nobody and will alarm nobody. What will the next Congress care for such a prohibition? What will the people of Kansas care for it? They have never asked, or desired, an enabling act from Congress—nor will a disabling act affect them one whit more seriously. A new people are not to be so easily discouraged in making Constitutions. It is a sort of amusement which they will not lightly forego. The people of Kansas have a new one already on hand—and they will make a good deal faster than Congress can reject them.

Apart from its meanness, no feature of this bill is more conspicuous than the political blindness and stolidity of its author. They have dismounted the Republicans, in Kansas and in Congress, for seeking to prolong this contest, and make political capital out of it. And they have given them means and an opportunity of doing so, which neither chance nor their own blundering could have furnished. The struggle now goes to Kansas. The Lecompton Constitution will there be rejected. A new one will be immediately sent to Congress, and a fresh application will be made for admission. The Republicans will then wake up the issue at Washington and through the country. Admission cannot be resisted upon any grounds which will not stimulate Northern feeling, and keep alive the agitation which the Senate bill professes to explode. And every man, with half an eye, can see that every successive struggle gives occasion for a new victory of the North.

The political effect of passing this bill, therefore, will be merely to damage its authors and abettors, and to build up its opponents. The Republicans, and they alone, will reap solid and substantial benefits from its enactment. The Southern men who have pushed and passed it will have thrown away the ground they have abandoned their original ground, and consented to the submission of the Lecompton No-Slavery Constitution to the vote of the people of Kansas. The Northern Democrats who opposed them on the outset, and then lost standing with the Administration party at home, have alienated their new friends by their retreat, and will find themselves overboard and helpless. The Administration has all the odium of attempting a bad measure without the ability to carry it, and they will all find the whole subject thrown back upon them, just when they will be most unwilling to meet it. This is very much like all Democratic victories in extraordinary Administration—every new one is worse than a fresh disaster. If the Republicans do not reap positive and marked advantages from the passage of this bill, it will be because they lack the ability to use their opportunities aright.

SPEECH OF HON. JOHN A. BINGHAM,

OF OHIO,

DELIVERED

On the Conference Bill for the Admission of Kansas.

In the House of Representatives, April 28, 1858.

The House having under consideration the report of the Conference Committee on Senate bill No. 16, for the admission of the State of Kansas into the Union—

Mr. BINGHAM said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I congratulate the country that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS] has seen fit on this day to acknowledge what he has heretofore, during the last sixty days of this Congress, steadily and persistently denied, that the position of those with whom I have the honor to act on this floor and elsewhere, in regard to the power of Congress upon the said Convention shall be, and hereby is, authorized to form a Constitution and State Government for the people of the said Territory, provided the Constitution to be formed, in virtue of the authority hereby given, shall be republican, and consistent with the Constitution of the United States; that it shall contain the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty; that it shall secure to the citizen the trial by jury in all criminal cases, and the privileges of the writ of *habeas corpus*, conformably to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; and that after the admission of the said Territory of Orleans as a State comes in, she will have upon which such State may pass shall be promulgated, and its records of every description shall be preserved, and its judicial and legislative written proceedings conducted, in the language in which the laws and the judicial and legislative written proceedings of the United States are now published and conducted: *And provided, also*, That the said Convention shall provide, by an ordinance, irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people inhabiting the said Territory do agree and declare, that they forever disclaim all right or title to the waste or unappropriated lands lying within the said Territory; and that the same shall be and remain at the sole and entire disposition of the United States; and, moreover, that each and every tract of land sold by Congress shall be and remain exempt from any tax, laid by the order or under the authority of the State, whether for State, county, or township, or any other purpose whatever, for the term of five years from and after the respective days of the sales thereof; and that the lands belonging to citizens of the United States, residing without the said State, shall never be taxed higher than the lands belonging to persons residing therein; and that no taxes shall be imposed on lands the property of the United States; and that the river Mississippi, and the navigable rivers and waters leading into the same shall be common highways, and forever free, as well to the inhabitants of the said State as to other citizens of the United States, without any tax, duty, impost, or toll, thereof imposed by the said State."

I am not here to find fault with the arguments of the learned gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. DAVIS;] or with the not less learned gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. STEPHENS,] with the new lights he has discovered in his way to this political Damascus. The latter gentleman has, if your please, become an ally of the Republicans. He is working (not voting) with us today. He is agreeing with us that Congress is restricted in nothing but its own conviction and its own judgment, in regard to the limitations which it may impose upon the sovereignty of the Constitution, upon new States, as conditions precedent to their admission into the Union.

To make good my assertion, I need only refer specifically to the limitations imposed by the enabling act of 1811, upon the people of the admission of the State of Louisiana, which I have just read, and which the gentleman from Georgia approves, and upon which he takes his stand.

That statute, I repeat, goes as far as I have ever ventured to go on this question, and as far as any gentleman upon this side has ever ventured to go. I beg the attention of the House to the conditions precedent and restrictions which that act imposed upon the sovereignty of Louisiana. First, there is the condition precedent that before the people of Louisiana, after the election of their delegates to a Convention, should take another step towards the organization of a State government, the Constitution so assembled, should, in their behalf, declare that they accept the Constitution of the United States, together, of course, with all its limitations and restrictions upon State sovereignty. That was the first condition precedent, and not before, they might proceed to form a State Constitution; provided, says the statute—

"That said Constitution so to be formed shall be *republican*; shall be consistent with the Constitution of the United States; shall provide and declare the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty; shall secure to every citizen charged with a criminal offence a trial by jury; and, also, the benefit of the writ of *habeas corpus*, as provided in the Constitution of the United States; shall provide that the legislation and judicial action of said State be conducted in the English language; shall surrender the right of the State over certain waste lands; also, its right to tax United States property."

Sir, this statute does not stop where certain gentlemen upon the other side of the House have been willing to stop their power stops, to wit: with the mere declaration that the Constitution of the proposed new State should, be *republican*. That statute, as I have shown, goes much further, and requires that the new Constitution should comply with the conditions and restrictions which I have enumerated. This statute further provides, in the fourth section, that the Constitution so framed shall be submitted to the Congress of the United States for approval or rejection; for what purpose? To give to the Congress of the United States the opportunity of judging whether these conditions precedent had been complied with; whether the people had, by their legally chosen delegates, accepted the Constitution of the United States; whether their new Constitution, contrary to and in contravention of their local laws—the civil law under which they then lived—secured the right of trial by jury in all criminal cases; whether the writ of *habeas corpus* was secured to the citizens within the limits of the State; and whether, in addition, their Constitution declared, as required, the great and fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty. All these conditions precedent appeared, Congress, by this fourth section, reserved the power to say that Louisiana should not be permitted to organize herself into a State Government for admission into this Union—admission, which would become a State, but should remain a Territory.

I ask the gentleman from Georgia, in order that I may make no mistake in this matter, whether he concedes that that enactment was constitutional? I ask the gentleman from Georgia, in 1811, under the Federal Constitution, to dictate to the people of Louisiana the conditions precedent their Constitution should be consistent with the Constitution of the United States? whether he considers Congress fully competent for Congress, under that act of 1811, to dictate to that people the further condition precedent that they should secure the right of trial by jury, in all criminal cases, to citizens within the limits of the State? I ask whether that was competent for Congress, by that act, to dictate to the people of Louisiana, as a further condition precedent to the establishment of a State Government, and their admission into the Union, that they should be formed out of the right of *habeas corpus* in all cases, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States? and, finally, I ask him whether he concedes that it was competent for the Government of the United States, speaking through Congress, by that act, to declare that that people should abolish their civil law, and take ours? If he concedes all this, as he did by citing that act, he concedes that I, and many of those with my friends have ever claimed, in this great controversy. Who, sir, is to judge whether the Constitution, framed by a people within a Territory, is consistent with the Constitution of the United States? Is it the Congress of the United States, which the gentleman planted himself, it is manifestly declared that the Congress of the United States shall judge of that, and no one else. That is Republicanism—*Black* Republicanism.

Mr. CURTIS. I beg the gentleman's pardon; it is not Black Republicanism, as some understand it.

Mr. BINGHAM. It is my Black Republicanism. That legislation of 1811 is established by precedent and commanding authority. It was sanctioned and approved by a man who has been called the Father of the Constitution by way of pre-eminence—Mr. Madison. In addition to the restrictions which have been cited, me what he has written on this provision of the Constitution, that Congress "*may* admit new States into the Union." He says:

"In this article of Confederation, no provision is found on this important subject. Canada was to be admitted of right on her joining 'in the measures of the United States, and the other *colonies*, by which were evidently meant, the other British colonies, at the discretion of nine States. The eventual establishment of *new States* seems to have been overlooked by the compilers of that instrument. We have seen the inconvenience of this omission, and the assumption of power into which Congress has been led by it. With great propriety, therefore, has the new system supplied the defect. The general precaution that no new States shall be formed without the concurrence of the Federal authority * * * * is consonant to the principles which ought to govern such transactions."

There is where I stand; there is where those with whom I act, in reference to this question, stand; that there can be no such thing as an existing State, organized within the national territories, outside of the Union, and without the consent of the Federal Government; that there can be, under our Constitution, no new State rightfully organized within a United States Territory, except it be organized in consonance with the Constitution of the United States, and with the consent of the Government of the United States given to such State organization, either previously or subsequently to its formation, and before the admission of such State into the Union. That is the position of Madison, that is the Republican position, and that seems to be the position of the gentleman from Georgia. Sir, other precedents justify me in saying that conditions and restrictions upon the organization of State Governments within the Territories may be imposed by the Congress of the United States. I speak now of new States organized within the Territories of the Union more particularly. I do not wish to speak now of the organization of new States within the territory of a single State of the Union. That belongs to another provision of the Constitution, and we have nothing to do with it in this issue. We have other precedents, sir, for the position we assume of this character for which I am contending, other than restrictions upon new States—precedents furnished by the action of the fathers of the Constitution.

Sir, there was a condition precedent in the act providing for the admission of the State which I have the honor in part to represent, and which authorized the people of Ohio to frame a State Constitution and Government, preparatory to their admission into the Union. I will read the precedent in this case:

"That the Constitution so to be formed by the people of the Territory of Ohio shall not be repugnant to the sixth article of the ordinance [Ordinance of 1787]."

What was that article? It was, sir:

"That Slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, should be forever prohibited."

Upon that condition the State of Ohio was permitted to organize a Constitution, and to come into the Union. The men who framed that statute, and who voted for it in this and in the other Hall, did not get this new idea into their heads, sir, when they came to frame a Constitution and organize a State Government, and *demand* admission into the Union upon the *simple condition* that their Constitution should be *republican*. What is a republican Constitution? A republican government is simply a government where the sovereign authority is exercised through delegates or representatives chosen by the people. The Congress of 1802, which provided for the admission of Ohio, did not get that idea into their heads